



Piccini, A., Martindale, A., Lyons, N., Nicholas, G., Angelbeck, B., Connaughton, S. P., Grier, C., Herbert, J., Leon, M., Marshall, Y., Schaepe, D., Supernant, K., & warwick, G. (2016). Archaeology as Partnerships in Practice: A Reply to La Salle and Hutchings. *Canadian Journal of Archaeology*, 40(1), 191-204.
<http://canadianarchaeology.com/caa/publications/canadian-journal-archaeology/40/1>

Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

[Link to publication record in Explore Bristol Research](#)
PDF-document

This is the final published version of the article (version of record). It first appeared online via the Canadian Archaeological Association at <http://canadianarchaeology.com/caa/publications/canadian-journal-archaeology/40/1>. Please refer to any applicable terms of use of the publisher.

University of Bristol - Explore Bristol Research

General rights

This document is made available in accordance with publisher policies. Please cite only the published version using the reference above. Full terms of use are available:
<http://www.bristol.ac.uk/red/research-policy/pure/user-guides/ebr-terms/>

Archaeology as Partnerships in Practice: A Reply to La Salle and Hutchings

Andrew Martindale[†], Natasha Lyons^{‡§}, George Nicholas[§],
Bill Angelbeck[‡], Sean P. Connaughton[‡], Colin Grier[‡],
James Herbert[#], Mike Leon[□], Yvonne Marshall^{*}, Angela Piccini[†],
David M. Schaepe[◇], Kisha Supernant[∇], and Gary Warrick^{✱◇}

CRITIQUE HAS A CENTRAL ROLE IN the advancement of scholarship. It can and has transformed, and at times revolutionized, anthropological thinking by revealing fundamental flaws of logic and bias in scholarly orthodoxies and the power asymmetries to which they are aligned. Some of these biases are consciously held logical frameworks while others include less discursive forms of knowledge construction—facets of

ideology that Anthony Giddens (1984) argued were both more powerful than declared intentions and less visible—at least to those not occupying a subaltern perspective. Challenges to the latter unravel our foundational expectations of reality and, if resonant, can “make us squirm,” as some of us have noted (La Salle and Hutchings 2016:165; Martindale and Lyons 2014:430). Thus we welcome this opportunity to respond to

[†] Department of Anthropology, University of British Columbia, 6303 N.W. Marine Drive, Vancouver, BC V6T 1Z1 [andrew.martindale@ubc.ca]

[‡] Ursus Heritage Consulting, 11500 Coldstream Creek Road, Coldstream, BC V1B 1E3 [natasha@ursus-heritage.ca]

[§] Department of Archaeology, Simon Fraser University, 8888 University Dr., Burnaby, BC V5A 1S6 [nicholas@sfu.ca]

[‡] Department of Anthropology and Sociology, Douglas College, 700 Royal Avenue, New Westminster, BC V3M 5Z5 [angelbeckw@douglascollege.ca]

[#] Kwantlen Polytechnic University, Department of Anthropology, Surrey, BC/Inlailawatash Limited Partnerships, North Vancouver, BC [seanconn7@hotmail.com]

[□] Department of Anthropology Washington State University, Box 644910 Pullman, WA 99164-4910 [cgrier@wsu.edu]

^{*} Stantec Consulting Ltd., 500-4730 Kingsway, Burnaby, BC V5H 0C6 [james.herbert@stantec.com]

[□] Katzie First Nation, 10946 Katzie Road, Pitt Meadows, BC V3Y 2G6 [michaelt1@live.com]

^{*} Department of Archaeology, University of Southampton, UK [ymm@soton.ac.uk]

[†] School of Arts, University of Bristol, Cantocks Close, Woodland Road, Bristol, UK BS8 1UP [a.a.piccini@bristol.ac.uk]

[◇] Stó:lō Nation/Stó:lō Research & Resource Management Centre, 10-7201 Vedder Road, Chilliwack, BC V2R 4G5 [dave.schaepe@stolonation.bc.ca]

[∇] Department of Anthropology, 3-15 HM Tory Building, University of Alberta, Edmonton, AB T6G 2H4 [kisha.supernant@ualberta.ca]

[✱] Indigenous Studies, Wilfrid Laurier University, Brantford Campus, 73 George Street, Brantford, ON N3T 2Y3 [gwarrick@wlu.ca]

[◇] Authorship: AM, NL, GN drafted the document, BA, SC, CG, JH, ML, YM, AP, DS, KS, GW (listed in alphabetical order) edited and revised.

La Salle and Hutchings' critique of the special section, "Community-Oriented Archaeology," which appeared in 2014 in the *Canadian Journal of Archaeology*. This discussion raises issues that resonate locally, globally (see also Hutchings and La Salle 2015) and beyond archaeology.

Issues of power, positionality, and knowledge construction have consistently been playing out in the discourse about Indigenous heritage, and the role of archaeology therein. As one of us (Nicholas 2010a) has argued, some archaeologists have moved past a crossroads in which the old guard of non-Indigenous scholars with non-Indigenous assumptions studying Indigenous history and culture via archaeology have been challenged by both Indigenous scholars (e.g., Atalay 2012; Bruchac 2014; Nicholas 2010b; Reimer 2011; Two Bears 2006; Watkins 2010a) and by those non-Indigenous scholars working in aid of ensuring a broader, more accommodating archaeology. Archaeology is changed and is changing as a result of this critique.¹ This was a position expanded on in "Community-Oriented Archaeology."

However, La Salle and Hutchings argue that not only do our efforts not go far enough in moving in that direction but, more troublingly and despite our language of inclusion, we are guilty of calculated or ignorant attempts to slow the critique and preserve our places of privilege as "authorities" of the Indigenous past.² These are serious charges.

Have we facilitated the exclusion of Indigenous voices from our work for self-serving ends? To some extent we have, and aspects of La Salle and Hutchings' criticism are both valid of us and applicable to much of archaeology. However, it is mildly ironic that the same criticism can and should be leveled at

La Salle and Hutchings: a search of their publications reveals that their academic careers are based on critique and, unlike ourselves, they have no visible collaborations with Indigenous communities. That said, our reply is not intended as an *ad hominem* tit for tat. We recognize the role of critique but argue that the practice of archaeology in partnership with Indigenous communities is of value in exploring and confronting archaeological ethnocentrism and untethering archaeology from its colonial anchors. Indeed, our response is not directed at La Salle and Hutchings *per se*, but to the Indigenous communities with whom we work. We firmly believe that this is not merely an academic exercise but something that has real consequences for Indigenous peoples and thus for contemporary society in general.

Despite their combative tone, La Salle and Hutchings' logic is closely aligned with ours, as we elaborate on below. We do much of what they argue we do not do and we do not do things of which they accuse us. In this reply, we itemize and clarify these issues. In what follows, we start by correcting factual errors before moving to an analysis of four foundational issues: 1) Can archaeology reveal history? 2) Does archaeology inevitably contribute to marginalizing Indigenous peoples? 3) Are archaeology and other forms of scholarship simply self-serving acts of maintaining the colonial status quo? and 4) Does archaeology have value to Indigenous communities and other marginalized or subaltern peoples? We argue that archaeology can be about history, can confront colonialism, is not simply a Western self-serving indulgence, and can have value to Indigenous communities in Canada and elsewhere. We suggest that the model that most advances this goal, the model that our papers explored, is

archaeology in partnerships with descent communities, which in settler contexts are primarily Indigenous.

Errors in La Salle and Hutchings

Seven charges have been leveled: 1) that our compilation does not define archaeology; 2) that we exclude an analysis of private sector Cultural Resource Management; 3) that we ignore archaeology's role in contemporary constructions of identity; 4) that we hijack the concept of community orientation for self-serving goals; 5) that we ignore racism in archaeology; 6) that we exclude non-academics and non-Indigenous scholars from our work; and 7) that we did not invite La Salle to join the special section in order to marginalize her critique.

1. Defining "Archaeology"

La Salle and Hutchings (2016:164) argue that "few of the authors in this collection directly address their vision of what archaeology is," and that

by not defining archaeology in terms of how it is most commonly practiced, we argue the collective work misses the mark, with serious consequences for descendent communities [La Salle and Hutchings 2016:166].

In fact, archaeology *is* defined and described in nine points in the first paragraph of the editors' introduction (Martindale and Lyons 2014:425) as: 1) a relationship between archaeologists and the people they study; 2) stories that archaeologists tell about the people of the past; 3) an imperfect relationship between materiality in the present and the people of history; 4) an issue that archaeologists oversimplify based on expectations they have about their own

lives; 5) a set of limitations with respect to understanding history; 6) a vulnerability to ethnocentrism in archaeology that increases when archaeologists and the people they study have cultural distance; 7) a double standard in which archaeology values its own Western-derived way of knowing over that of the people it claims to represent; 8) a discipline that confers privileges to archaeologists at the expense of Indigenous peoples (though we also note that this asymmetry extends to African-American, Latino, and Chinese communities, as well as others); and 9) an asymmetrical system of power in which the dominant archaeological view does not perceive the asymmetry.

La Salle and Hutchings also state that, "The clearest attempt to define archaeology is by Angela Piccini and David Schaepe (2014:467, citing Clarke 1973:6) who state 'archaeology is what archaeologists do.'" The full quote is considerably richer and captures many of the ideas La Salle and Hutchings claim to value.

Quite simply, "archaeology is what archaeologists do" (Clarke 1973:6). That is, archaeological practice makes rather than finds archaeology; it is a discipline that does "not start with its own self-definition, but with practices that have come to be called archaeological" (Shanks 2012:41). What is at stake in the contemporary work of archaeology, then, is the continuing need to account for archaeology's entangled enactments—of archaeologists, communities, traditions, habits, technologies, landscapes, bureaucracies, tools, materials—of the past in the present in order, ultimately, to practice archaeology better (Kintigh et al. 2014; Sassaman 2014).

La Salle and Hutchings (2016:167) further argue that the perceived lack of a definition for archaeology permits our obfuscation on its transformation, thus creating “a short-sighted and potentially dangerous approach that ignores the politics of heritage construction”. However, our definition explicitly states from the outset that archaeology is vulnerable to being the ethnocentric expression of vested interests. We argue forcefully that this vulnerability includes structural asymmetries such as heritage legislation and the power of capital (Martindale and Lyons 2014:426, 429–430) and cultural asymmetries such as racism and the construction of knowledge (Martindale and Lyons 2014:430; Martindale and Nicholas 2014:441–442) that are the colonial legacies of settler nations such as Canada. Indeed, our thesis is that:

The complexities of this endeavor are often overlooked within the practice of community-oriented archaeology, especially by non-Indigenous archaeologists working with Indigenous descent communities. We further argue that these complexities emerge both from the foundational assumptions of the discipline and the naiveté of archaeological practitioners, neither of which need undermine the utility of a community-oriented practice. We conclude that while a community-oriented archaeology should promote a more sophisticated archaeology, a clearer sense of why is needed [Martindale and Lyons 2014:426].

Later, Martindale and Lyons (2014:429) propose an answer to where

power inequalities emerge in archaeology:

the structural asymmetries of funding and law mean that in the absence of an intentional ethical purpose, archaeological practice in both CRM and research contexts easily benefits the archaeologist at the expense of the descent community.

In this we are in accord with La Salle and Hutchings, despite their critique that we are not.

2. *Excluding CRM*

La Salle and Hutchings argue that,

we therefore conclude Community-Oriented Archaeology is defining archaeology as academic, a narrow and outdated view that ignores cultural resource management (CRM).

As noted above, the colonial imposition of legal and economic asymmetries are foundational to our view of archaeology. Approximately 15% (25 of 170 pages) of the special section discusses the CRM industry, including two papers that focus on the subject:³ Angelbeck and Grier (2014), who argue that long-term CRM-First Nations partnerships confront such asymmetries, and Connaughton et al. (2014) who argue that ethical practice is possible within (and despite) the constraints of the CRM industry. Their analysis outlines the barriers within the CRM industry to ethical practice; to suggest that this reproduces a “culture of silence” (La Salle and Hutchings 2016:174) is inaccurate. Mike Leon’s (Katzie First Nation) voice confronting

both silence and tokenism is clear in Connaughton et al. (2014:552):

First Nation members should go into the field knowing that when they are working with archaeologists, the government, and/or the developers, that they are there to participate in the process. Therefore, all parties involved in development must understand that the presence of First Nations is just as important as that of the archaeologists.

La Salle and Hutchings (2016:173) further argue “archaeology/CRM may be viewed as statecraft, government technology designed to clear Indigenous heritage from the landscape in advance of economic development”. While we agree that there is a state intervention via archaeology upon Indigenous territory, we disagree that archaeology is simply or inevitably statecraft. Archaeology and its CRM manifestations exist in many forms, some of which actively confront government intrusion into both heritage and Indigenous territory (see Lyons et al. 2012a for a fuller discussion). Such sweeping generalizations ignore both the co-option of archaeological practice by First Nations (see Connaughton et al. 2014; Menzies 2015a, 2015b, for example), and the substantial influence First Nations governments employ in discussions with regulators about the treatment of archaeological resources (see Lyons et al. 2012a).

La Salle and Hutchings argue that the current system is sufficiently flawed that it must be abandoned. We propose a different assessment of the current context and thus of archaeological practice. In contrast, our approach is to advocate for the development of partnerships

with Indigenous communities, as well as to agitate for change in heritage legislation⁴ (e.g., IPinCH 2015; Welch and Ferris 2014). While we respect La Salle and Hutchings’ view that the system is deeply flawed, we believe that many archaeologists—in CRM, academic, and government contexts—are transforming their practices to be of benefit to Indigenous communities. Indeed, our special section is an exploration of such transformations, and we are not alone in either this ambition or this approach. As Atalay et al. (2014:9) argue, disruptions of the power imbalances in archaeology are more effective and more appropriate when emergent from partnerships of practice than, “top-down, researcher-driven, or government mandated.”

3. Ignoring Identity

La Salle and Hutchings argue that

the authors collectively reproduce the culture of silence around archaeology’s pivotal role in the ongoing disempowerment of Indigenous peoples, their heritage, and their land. These omissions are significant because it is in the acts of forgetting and erasure that archaeologists do the most harm to living communities [La Salle and Hutchings 2016:174].

In fact, we address this issue frequently, as for example,

When non-Indigenous archaeologists apply causal logic to Indigenous history that they do not apply to themselves or to their own histories, it re-creates the double standard that Western people consistently apply to Aboriginal people: that their capabilities are

somehow different [Martindale and Lyons 2014:430].

Five articles in the special section address this issue specifically. Martindale and Nicholas (2014) argue that archaeological claims of scientific neutrality perpetuate a double standard in which cultural tradition (such as spirituality) are permitted when archaeologists study Western history but disavowed when the subject is Indigenous history.⁵ Piccini and Schaepe (2014) argue that archaeology is foundational to the construction of contemporary identity in Indigenous and Western communities. Lyons and Marshall (2014) confront simplistic interpretations of material belongings by juxtaposing Indigenous knowledge with that of orthodox archaeology. Connaughton et al. (2014) argue that CRM archaeology disenfranchises Indigenous Peoples of their material heritage and in doing so diverts Indigenous capital, power, and authority to non-Indigenous archaeologists, governments, companies and developers. Supernant and Warrick (2014) argue that colonial history has granted archaeology power in determining authenticity in claims to ancestry, a power that they argue archaeologists fail to recognize. Thus, the claim by La Salle and Hutchings that we do not explore the role of archaeology in constructing colonial visions of indigeneity to the detriment of Indigenous communities is clearly false. Again, they are largely in agreement with our work (and vice versa), despite their claims otherwise.

4. Hijacking Indigenous Archaeology

La Salle and Hutchings claim that the construct of community-oriented archaeology hijacks Indigenous archaeology.⁶ They write,

we find it ironic and troubling that the spirit of community archaeology—to orient archaeology towards affected descendant communities—has been appropriated such that archaeologists are the descendants and archaeology the community affected [La Salle and Hutchings 2016:167].

Elsewhere they state,

the articles in *Community-Oriented Archaeology* have been written by archaeologists, for archaeologists, about archaeology. This is a significant deviation from the vision of Indigenous archaeology commonly espoused as by, with, and for Indigenous peoples [La Salle and Hutchings 2016:170].

La Salle and Hutchings misunderstand that our use of community-oriented archaeology is intentionally *not* synonymous with Indigenous archaeology, precisely to avoid co-opting the term. We created the term “community-oriented archaeology” as a broad signal that archaeology can never be neutral, but will always be oriented to a specific community. Our purpose, as we noted, was to confront archaeological illusions of objectivity that serve to mask the imposition of Western ethnocentric values upon Indigenous peoples and their history(ies). As Martindale and Lyons (2014:427) wrote:

We specifically wished to direct attention towards the community that is archaeology, both as a professional and academic caste and, following Sahlins (1996), as a discipline that reflects a cultur-

ally specific view of human nature emerging from western history. Subjecting this community to interrogation helps move non-Indigenous archaeologists from a safe space of unassailable privilege to a critique of our motives (both acknowledged and tacit), our methods, and our interactions with cultural others, past and present.

This is a complex issue, and we recognize and agree with much of La Salle and Hutchings' critique on this point (see below). However, we think that confronting archaeology's structural biases benefits from (though is not limited to) an exploration of archaeological assumptions that emerge from its orientation to Western culture.⁷ It is important to remember that by framing community-oriented archaeology as the larger issue, we are striving to include other, non-Indigenous communities.

5. *Ignoring Racism*

La Salle and Hutchings (2016:168) express dismay that, "frank discussions of racism do not appear in Community-Oriented Archaeology". While we agree that more could and needs to be said on this issue, this criticism is overstated. As Martindale and Lyons (2014:427) assert about the asymmetries of archaeological interpretation, "the parallels to racism in this double standard are difficult to ignore (Echo-Hawk 2010; Echo-Hawk and Zimmerman 2006)." Similarly, Martindale and Nicholas (2014) argue,

like many asymmetrical power relations, the arbitrary invention of race is more visible to individuals who occupy subaltern positions in the power hierarchy; those who occupy the dominant racial taxa

are often unaware that a racialized landscape exists or of the asymmetries it perpetuates and are ignorant of their own role in constructing it (Prakash 1994; Sharp 2008).

La Salle and Hutchings also argue that we "quickly move past such matters to discuss solutions" and "reframe the dynamic as not about race but 'philosophical concurrence.'" While our language was cumbersome, Martindale and Nicholas' central thesis is that different cultural standpoints generate different perceptions of reality. These become enshrined as structural asymmetries of power that become manifest in colonial projects such as archaeology; this is essentially a critique of racism, but one that broadens the cause from racialization (a Western construct) to culturally constructed expectations of reality (a construct that accommodates non-Western cultural contexts.) We acknowledge La Salle and Hutchings' point that we could have been braver in making this connection directly. However, in part, we wanted to include other standpoints beyond race in our logic. We are also attentive to the argument from such Indigenous scholars as Tallbear (2013) and Weaver (2001) who argue that Indigenous concepts of blood ancestry are not the same as Western constructs of race.⁸ Thus an exploration of racism, though valuable, cannot be the end of the conversation about ethnocentrism.

6. *Excluding Indigenous Archaeologists*

La Salle and Hutchings note the limited representation of Indigenous authors in the special section,

we wonder whether the authors of Community-Oriented Archaeology could have made strides towards

rectifying this inequality had they elected to co-publish with their collaborating communities.

This is a valid critique (although several authors in the special section *are* Indigenous), indeed one we ourselves stated,

these contributors are primarily non-Indigenous archaeologists working with Indigenous descent communities. This special section is thus a partial view of a complex subject, and one criticism you should have of it is the lack of representation of Indigenous voices [Martindale and Lyons 2014:428].

While there is a valid critique of self-indulgence in this direction, we argued that there was merit in this conversation. La Salle and Hutchings omit reference to the work that we have done and continue to do *with* and *for* Indigenous partners. These include both publications⁹ (e.g., Grier and Shaver 2008; Hennessy et al. 2013; Lyons et al. 2010, 2012b; Martindale and Marsden 2003; 2011; McHalsie et al. 2001; Nicholas 2010b; Schaepe et al. 2001; Sutton et al. 2003), reports, and projects in multiple media that do not produce publications.¹⁰

7) *Marginalizing La Salle*

Finally, La Salle and Hutchings criticize us for excluding La Salle from the special section, arguing that “her critiques are not mentioned in Community-Oriented Archaeology.” This implies that we intentionally marginalized her voice to avoid her critique. La Salle’s (2013) presentation at the Canadian Archaeological Association conference session from which these papers were drawn was largely a reproduction of her 2010

publication, a source that is cited seven times in our papers. Similarly, La Salle and Hutchings (2012) is cited six times. As we note throughout our reply, we are largely and demonstrably in agreement with La Salle, so it is illogical to argue that we avoided her critique or that we are fundamentally opposed to her views. Moreover, as Martindale and Lyons (2014:427) noted, our purpose was

to build out of biographical accounts and case study examples of community-oriented engagements to evaluate whether and in what manner archaeology transforms under this rubric.

The special section included less than half of the papers in the symposium, focusing on those that presented advanced, novel projects. The coherence of the special section was founded on the analysis of archaeologists who work in partnership with Indigenous communities and this includes neither La Salle nor Hutchings.

Foundational Issues

La Salle and Hutchings challenge us on four key issues: 1) that we assume archaeology is an exploration of history; 2) that we do not seriously engage with the asymmetries of power in archaeology; 3) that our papers serve only to secure our privileged scholarly and professional authority; and 4) that we assume that archaeology, specifically our archaeology, has value to Indigenous descent communities. None of these challenges is unique to our papers. Indeed, much of our work, like that of La Salle and Hutchings, is a consideration of these claims and a confrontation (albeit imperfect) with the asymmetries in archaeological partnerships.

1. Archaeology (not) as History

La Salle and Hutchings make the provocative case that archaeology is not nor can be a study of the past. They note,

One could conclude that the aim of community archaeology is to “understand history” (Martindale and Nicholas 2014:434) rather than the present, a short-sighted and potentially dangerous approach [La Salle and Hutchings 2016:167].

While it may seem illogical to some archaeologists to defend their discipline’s ability to discern the past, this is one of La Salle and Hutchings’ ideas that has value but which we did not fully address (although this is the subject and thesis of Piccini and Schaepe’s [2014] essay, and is discussed in Supernant and Warrick’s [2014] paper). In some significant ways, archaeology is very much about the present (see for example Graves-Brown et al. 2013). That is, the questions we direct at the archaeological record and the epistemologies, methods, and interpretive logics we use reveal as much about ourselves as they do about past peoples. Throughout our special section we acknowledged the deep and powerful influence of ethnocentrism by archaeology on Indigenous history, yet we maintained—and still do—that these biases could be at least partially mitigated in two ways: via self-reflection, and via scrutiny from descendent communities. Indeed, this was the point of the special section and its gravitation to authors who are archaeologists who work with and for Indigenous communities; thus the papers are self-reflections on archaeology that were provoked by aligning with and in many cases deferring research agendas to Indigenous descent

communities. We sought to identify and accommodate limitations within archaeology, but our efforts are directed to not just critique but to actively seek, as La Salle and Hutchings (2016:168) somewhat derisively note, “solutions.” We believe solutions are not only possible, but desired, for three reasons.

First, despite its ethnocentrisms, we think that archaeology does describe and can potentially interpret the past, and much of our work is built out of this assumption. Our view is both optimistic but also, as Martindale and Nicholas (2014) note, potentially naïve. We acknowledge that this is not a simple task, given that archaeology both creates and is part of a society that perpetuates asymmetries of power. Thus we recognize the value in La Salle and Hutchings’ staking a polarized view and challenging the ability of archaeology to achieve its stated and implied goals via “truth-telling” (Hutchings and La Salle 2016). However, it is equally naïve and marginalizing to descent communities to argue that archaeology is unable to explore history (see Battle-Baptiste 2010; Handsman 1995; Leone 2010 for further discussion). The material products of past peoples are a reflection of their lives. Thus, the issue is not whether archaeology can explore history, but whether archaeologists can overcome their ethnocentrisms, and this is a subject of considerable discussion in our papers. Second, La Salle and Hutchings’ thesis is opposed by many Indigenous archaeologists, and we cannot discount the value they see in the discipline (e.g., Atalay 2008; Bruchac 2007; Gould 2014; Menzies 2015a; Watkins 2003, 2010b; Wilcox 2009). This issue is part of a larger discourse on the ability of scholarship to move beyond its cultural framework toward what Martindale and

Nicholas (2014) referred to as a more federated interdisciplinarity. Lastly, the archaeology we discuss in our papers was done with the support and direction of our community partners. Although La Salle and Hutchings critique us for producing a self-reflexive suite of papers, the support of descent communities in assessing, confronting, and re-making archaeology cannot simply be ignored.

2. *Marginalization*

Archaeology is a colonialist enterprise. In settler contexts it has historically been largely an assessment of Indigenous history by non-Indigenous people unaware of or unconcerned with the foundational ethnocentrism in their perception (hence our special section's exploration of this important subject). The assumption of neutrality masks these asymmetries and obscures their manifestation in law, practice, and scholarship. This critique has existed for decades (e.g., Shanks and Tilley 1989). However, we think that archaeology is and can be more than its colonialist content if, as we argue and discuss, the views of Indigenous partners are the basis for critique¹¹ (e.g., Menzies 2013, 2015a, 2015b; Watkins 2010a). For example, Charles Menzies' appropriation of archaeology for Indigenous purposes demonstrates that the archaeological project is not simply a colonial project, but can remain archaeological even as a confrontation of colonialism. He writes:

What we did was different. We used the tools of archaeology, but we used them under our direction, not as hired hands or compliant observers. We weren't guided by mainstream disciplinary concerns to do science and make discoveries. We were, in a large sense,

doing what we normally do when we head out on the water, but we had added something more to look for: archaeological samples. That's the point, though. A meaningful collaboration is where the direction, focus, and design are led by Indigenous people—not the other way around [Menzies 2015b:19].

This work changes what archaeology can be, moving it towards contemporary purpose and non-orthodox forms of scholarship, including narrative (e.g., Irons 2012¹², Million 2003). Like many of us, including La Salle and Hutchings, Menzies (2015b:17) notes the complicity of research in power dynamics, even as researchers claim a neutral stance. If non-Indigenous archaeologists are to form meaningful partnerships with Indigenous communities, then they must reconcile their own role in the colonial project.

Is the goal of equality in Indigenous /non-Indigenous archaeology in this context “insulting,” as La Salle and Hutchings (2016:171) opine? Part of our approach is, following Croes (2010), pragmatic. Despite La Salle and Hutchings' protestations, archaeology is not going to stop nor is archaeological knowledge going to cease being consumed in the service of powerful and vested interests such as the state. Thus, we argue that there is merit in efforts by archaeologists to confront overt as well as more covert structural inequalities within archaeology and the consumption of archaeological knowledge. We chose to raise this critique in an academic journal, thus rendering our discussion academic. This is not the only venue for our discussions, and other contexts produce different kinds of analytical outcomes. However, ours necessarily,

and with some value, framed the issues in academic logic. For example, contrary to La Salle and Hutchings' view, archaeology has played a significant role in Aboriginal rights and titles cases. Recent rulings in *R. v Lax Kw'alaams* and *R. v Tsilchotin* illustrate both that courts use archaeological data with increasing frequency and they do so with foundational misunderstandings of the vulnerabilities to bias (Martindale 2014; Miller 2011). As Supernant and Warrick (2014:564) argue,

The Western legal and knowledge structures in which archaeologists work continue to lend undue credence to archaeological outcomes and the results of archaeological research can become implicated in how communities engage in claims for rights, title, and recognition in Canada.

Archaeological self-critique plays a valuable role in confronting the misuse of archaeology by the state. Arguments such as from Martindale and Nicholas (2014) serve to undermine¹³ both the use of archaeology to refute Indigenous oral records and the testimony of archaeologists that contradict that of Indigenous scholars and knowledge-holders. Projects described by Angelbeck and Grier, Supernant and Warrick, and Lyons and Marshall allow both archaeological knowledge and Indigenous scholarship to work in concert to explore both the subject of history and the capacities and limitations of archaeology. It is also important to note that some of our Indigenous partners preferred to not join in the authorship of our papers, but instead chose to allow their words to be presented as quotations. Partnerships take on many forms in different

contexts; some focus on collaborative practice during research, others on the production of knowledge for different audiences. Our academic view from largely non-Indigenous perspectives is situated, but not without value in these conversations. Thus, we see value in La Salle and Hutchings' critique of our papers, but not in their pessimism on the potential for a less colonial archaeology.

3. *Preserving the Status Quo*

La Salle and Hutchings argue that our efforts do not confront archaeological asymmetries but instead mask them in a more palatable form. They argue that our work does not sufficiently explore the colonial underpinnings of archaeology and in doing so, our collective approach "is at best superficial, at worst a lie" (La Salle and Hutchings 2016:172). Though challenging, this is a valuable critique on the essential nature of archaeology in settler nations (Trigger 1980, 1984; also McGuire 1992, 2008). Is archaeology so deeply compromised that it cannot avoid being colonial? Are its efforts at confronting both its colonial legacy and the contemporary manifestation of that legacy simply self-serving ways of perpetuating colonialism and privileging non-Indigenous archaeologists?

We argue that the contrast is neither as stark nor as simplistic as La Salle and Hutchings propose. That is, archaeology is not either Western or Indigenous, and translation, respect, and symmetry are indeed possible. At the same time, we would argue that contemporary archaeology is not a postcolonial undertaking, and we did not intend our optimistic view to be interpreted as such. Colonial processes and practices continue to support our institutional and social structures. Thus, following our Indigenous allies, we see our task as steadily expos-

ing, examining, and rectifying these societal inequalities (Atalay 2010a, 2010b; Grande 2003; Lydon and Rizvi 2010; Lyons 2013:84–88; Smith 2012:14, 2005).

Instead of assuming that archaeology is irrevocably colonial, we argue that there are logical grounds based on both intellectual and moral arguments for revealing, and thus for overcoming, its ethnocentrism. For example, Martindale and Nicholas' (2014) purpose is to create a logical argument that permits the spiritual knowledge of Indigenous tradition to be respected in archaeology, thereby addressing a pervasive and substantial omission in the non-native archaeology of Indigenous history. It is an attempt to overcome the very "spiritual dislocation" that La Salle and Hutchings (2016:174) decry. The motivation to explore and respectfully accommodate archaeological and Indigenous views emerges, as they note, from feminist scholars such as Wylie (2012) and Indigenous scholars such as Atleo (2004). Both use logic to confront and overcome ethnocentrism, and we share their implied optimism. Second, our Indigenous partners guide us in this view. Our engagement on shared projects and our efforts at creating a level playing field or tilting the balances of power in favour of Indigenous partners is real and both initiated and supported by these communities (e.g., Atalay 2010; Gould 2010; Kawelu 2015; McNiven 2016; Rigney 2003; Wilson 2007; Yellowhorn 2002).

Is archaeology itself, as La Salle and Hutchings argue, a vested interest? We agree that it is. Archaeology is a professional practice that, among other things, serves to advance the endeavour of archaeology and the careers of archaeologists (Menzies 2015b). As West (1995) argued, archaeologists Charles Borden and Wilson Duff cre-

ated the Heritage Conservation Act of British Columbia to shift control of Indigenous heritage to archaeologists (this process has been a world-wide one [Trigger 1984]). Similarly, Piccini and Schaepe (2014:467) note that efforts at co-production can and do mask neoliberal regulatory mechanisms that seek to control communities by making them agents of their own behaviour management. Contemporary archaeology is in part dedicated to rectifying these asymmetries (e.g., Atalay et al. 2014; Lydon and Rizvi 2010; Roth 2015). Thus, we are left as a discipline with a choice, and we are indebted to scholars like La Salle and Hutchings for raising such issues in stark terms. Do we work to end archaeology or do we work to transform it? That we choose the latter is, as La Salle and Hutchings note, in our own best interests. However, it is not only that. Piccini and Schaepe (2014:470) argued:

Yet, is it too easy to dismiss the collective move towards locating expertise within communities as simply a cynical exercise in "feel-good" public engagement, cost-cutting or white- (green-, or red-) washing corporate expansion? To dismiss out-of-hand risks a different kind of paternalistic marginalization of communities as unknowledgeable, fails to account for the multiplicities of agency and sidesteps what is at stake in contemporary archaeological practices: an attempt to account for archaeological work as not representing the world "out there", but as a key agent in worldmaking.

4. Indigenizing Archaeology

We think that La Salle and Hutchings oversimplify the nature of Indigenous/

non-Indigenous archaeological partnerships. These are not homogenous. Our own contexts include Indigenous communities whose members are archaeologists, who employ non-Indigenous archaeologists, who hire archaeologists (Indigenous and non-Indigenous), and who form academic research partnerships with non-Indigenous and Indigenous archaeologists. Some Indigenous communities frame their archaeological capacity as doing archaeology, being archaeological or the more distanced, monitoring of archaeology. Each of these dynamics creates its own structures of power over heritage and knowledge from those in which Indigenous communities direct archaeology, those which aspire to symmetrical partnerships, and those which work under and attempt to confront inequitable legislative regimes. Thus, they are not simply about divesting control of heritage to descent communities. Instead they are about the relationships between archaeologists and communities to achieve *a suite of goals* including divesting control of heritage but also protecting heritage, exploring history and transforming the arenas of power in archaeology and institutions that consume archaeological knowledge, and addressing inequalities in the contemporary world. These institutions of inequality include legislative and other state-sponsored interventions, but also ways of knowing and their vulnerabilities to misunderstanding.

Does archaeology have value to Indigenous communities? We cannot follow La Salle and Hutchings in answering this question on behalf of Indigenous people. Instead, our special section focused on the transformations in our practice and ideas about archaeology that emerge from partnerships with Indigenous communities. We argue that

although the ethnocentrism of archaeology are profound and entrenched in asymmetries of power, such partnerships are transformative, though they are the beginning not the end of processes of change. We turn again to Menzies, whose critique of archaeology and anthropology ends with guarded optimism:

Collaborative research might not be the best way for all researchers to operate, but it is a good way. Most research in aboriginal communities is still driven by external demands: corporate interests, colonially imposed legal frameworks, and external researchers' theoretical fashions and fancies. We would like to see that change. However, given the context of these forces for our Indigenous communities it makes sense to me to prioritize collaborative research over investigator-led researcher or academic research that denies its own embeddedness in colonial processes. It is best to work *with* or *for* First Nations rather than to work *on* us. (Menzies 2015b:18, emphasis in original).

A Beginning Rather than a Conclusion

We note that both Martindale and Lyons (2014:427) and La Salle and Hutchings (2016:174) quote Nicholas' comments as discussant to the symposium,

To be honest, I'm disappointed that overall the session doesn't move the discussion forward as much as I would have hoped. After 25-plus years of archaeology's engagement with "community," I have to ask what's really new here?"

Each of us has responded to this challenge. In our view, we have much in common with La Salle and Hutchings, except that our work exists in close, ongoing, often amiable and fruitful dialogue with Indigenous Peoples. If there is an undeclared theme in our papers it is that archaeology by non-Indigenous archaeologists addresses its limitations most profoundly, not via critique as La Salle and Hutchings argue, but as research that finds its relevance in working partnerships.

Each of our case studies puts archaeology and archaeologists in partnership with descent communities. As Piccini and Schaepe (2014:471) argued,

the aim is to rethink archaeology as a participatory practice that has the potential to transform the discipline from a method of institutional reproduction into a more radically Indigenous set of knowledge practices.

Their presentation of archaeology in the service of the Stó:lō Nation and Knowle West illustrates that the endeavor extends beyond the discipline to an exploration of belonging and wellbeing, of which an archaeological exploration of material history is simply a facet. Doing so appropriates archaeology for community purposes, within which archaeological research provides service to descent communities as they fight for their history and heritage, at times against the very orthodoxy of institutional archaeology. Piccini and Schaepe (2014:485) write,

Do we replace one limited archaeology with another due to undoubted exclusions, silences and lacunae? Who participates in

these participatory practices and who does not and how can archaeology intervene in and even mitigate such exclusions? Conversely, what are the potential risks to these communities in making cultural heritage accessible, especially when the terms of that access come to be framed through research partnerships with academic institutions and local government? In the cases of Stó:lō Nation and Knowle West we worked with communities to find ways to acknowledge and better value informal and tacit knowledges and to find ways to support communities to control and circulate their own intellectual property in the form of heritage. A significant aspect of this work involves accounting for the pervasiveness of archaeology in everyday life, a pervasiveness that may stretch conventional, academic definitions of archaeology.

Archaeology as service includes translation and advocacy across lines of colonialism. Lyons and Marshall's paper, for example, frames the archaeological task as translation between the cultural contexts of Indigenous material-worlds and interpretive frameworks supposed by archaeologists. Their purpose is to expand archaeological understanding in ways that include Indigenous insight into materiality. In return, Lyons and Marshall challenge the implicit colonialism in archaeology that renders other peoples' things as simplistic avatars for Western imaginaries of Indigenousness. Maori and Inuvialuit communities do not *benefit from* archaeology to explain their history; instead, they need archaeologists who will confront the ethnocentrism in archaeological orthodoxies that,

as La Salle and Hutchings note, is often implicated in statecraft. Martindale and Nicholas frame this translatable space in theoretical terms as a way of confronting the unacknowledged ethnocentrism hidden in objective/objectivism of law and archaeology. More importantly perhaps, Lyons and Marshall bear witness to Indigenous knowledge holders, conveying their scholarship to a wider audience, a role that Stoller (2007) argues is anthropology's most valuable service.

Angelbeck and Grier argue that collaborative research, though possible, is as La Salle (2010) argued more easily declared than fulfilled. Their presentation of non-Indigenous/Indigenous partnerships that have lasted decades illustrates that if equality is possible, it comes through life-long commitments. Theirs is a cautionary tale: no amount of good will or clever critique will illuminate non-Indigenous archaeological bias and the lacunae of ethnocentrism. Instead, they argue that the horizontalism that they aspire to is only possible when non-Indigenous archaeologists form commitments of partnership, of doing (and not doing) archaeology in ways and for purposes directed by the descent community. They conclude that it is the relationship itself that is the benefit:

Indigenous heritage—involving stories, traditions, protocols, histories, cultural materials, features and sites—comprise a form of capital. When this culture and history is shared with archaeologists, it is not just knowledge given, but something given with the anticipation of ongoing interactions and realization of reciprocal benefits. In this light, the importance of researchers returning and present-

ing results to Indigenous communities is clear. Traditional forms of long-term relationships provide a model which we must bring to archaeological practice and our collaborative efforts... In short, this notion—that a wrong is committed, some material compensation is offered and accepted, and thus the balance ledger is thereby settled—is incommensurate with how aboriginal notions of relationships work [Angelbeck and Grier 2016:534].

Finally, archaeology as partnerships with Indigenous descent communities improves archaeology. As Connaughton et al. (2014) argue, it has value even within the contested world of CRM. La Salle and Hutchings disagree, but their argument contains a foundational illogic: that is, they argue that archaeology is flawed but criticize efforts to improve it as being self-serving. We agree that archaeology is flawed. Supernant and Warrick (2014:565, 567) state that:

We must account for the fact that archaeology working in a neo-colonial context also has the possibility to do harm. Even when we are committed to a “postcolonial” or “decolonized” archaeology (following Atalay 2006), the funding, legislative, and education structure in which we work remain colonial... Archaeologists can recognize the rights of Indigenous communities to self-determination and sovereignty, but there are situations where the colonial systems increase inter- and intra-community tensions. These situations force us, as archaeologists, to confront the ongoing legacies of oppression,

colonization, and knowledge production, even when we are trying to work against these forces.

We also acknowledge that our efforts to improve archaeology are limited and that the discipline is, as Supernant and Warrick point out, vulnerable to its own colonialist forces and ignorance. However, we do not agree that there is no value in working towards a more inclusive, more accurate, and more equitable archaeology. The crux is how do we know when archaeology is beneficial to descent communities or when it is detrimental? To some extent a debate about whether archaeology can escape the bounds of its colonial heritage is a red herring: the changes that the idea evokes in archaeological practice are often more relevant than the idea itself. As all of us have argued, archaeological confrontations of colonialism are about redressing asymmetries of power (Angelbeck and Grier 2014:521, 523; Connaughton et al. 2014: 543–544; Lyons and Marshall 2014:510; Martindale and Lyons 2014:425, 427, 430; Martindale and Nicholas 2014:436, 441; Piccini and Schaepe 2014:469, 485; Supernant and Warrick 2014:580). Our papers explored the practice and context of archaeology as a form of critique, but our foundational thesis is that Indigenous communities are the ones to determine archaeological value for Indigenous communities. Our case studies are illustrations of the practice of putting archaeology, whether CRM or academic, in partnership with and at times in the service of Indigenous descent communities, and that doing so begins to redress the colonial legacies of power imbalance. The challenges, but also the value, of such efforts are highlighted in the final report of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada (2015) into Indian Residential Schools:

We are not there yet. The relationship between Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal peoples is not a mutually respectful one. But we believe we can get there, and we believe we can maintain it. Our ambition is to show how we can do that [V6, p. 3].

Reconciliation requires political will, joint leadership, trust building, accountability, and transparency, as well as a substantial investment of resources [V6, p. 16].

Together, Canadians must do more than just *talk* about reconciliation; we must learn how to *practise* reconciliation in our everyday lives—within ourselves and our families, and in our communities, governments, places of worship, schools, and work-places. To do so constructively, Canadians must remain committed to the ongoing work of establishing and maintaining respectful relationships [V6, p. 17].

The context of this enjoinder is a response to state-sponsored terrorization of Indigenous children and families via the Canadian government's program of cultural genocide implemented (in part) via Indian Residential Schools. The consequences of colonization on Indigenous communities are significant and brutal; conversations about archaeology have a role to play in the remediation of colonial transgression, but it is a modest one. The development of partnerships is the larger principle, and we suggest that partnerships of archaeological practice between Indigenous descent communities and the largely non-Indigenous endeavor of archaeology are the most significant arena from which to transform archaeol-

ogy and by which archaeology can resolve its value to Indigenous peoples. Contrary to La Salle and Hutchings' implication, our papers could never be an end point in this conversation. Instead, they are a step on a much longer path. We look forward to further discussions about what archaeology is and what it should be.

Acknowledgements. The authors are grateful to the Indigenous communities with whom they work. Many of the insights presented here and in the original special section emerged from conversations within these partnerships. We are grateful to Marina La Salle and Rich Hutchings for their critique and to Gary Coupland for the opportunity to respond.

Notes

1. This change is both slow and very incomplete, however, as reflected in McGhee's (2008) critique of Indigenous archaeology vs. replies by Colwell-Chanthaphonh et al. 2010; Croes 2010; Silliman 2010; Wilcox 2010.
2. These are separate issues, although the latter is more significant.
3. Fully half of the contributors to this volume are presently or have recently been CRM practitioners. CRM is an increasingly varied place to practice, and the dividing line between CRM and academia is an increasingly permeable one.
4. The Declaration on the Safeguarding of Indigenous Ancestral Burial Grounds as Sacred Sites and Cultural Landscapes, developed by members of the IPinCH Project (directed by Nicholas) states the importance of recognizing and protecting Indigenous ancestral burial sites and calls on all levels of government to work together to ensure such sites are not subject to alteration or damage. It is a reminder to all parties, including

both non-Indigenous governments and researchers, of their existing legal and ethical obligations with respect to First Nations sacred sites on which human remains of cultural and spiritual significance are interred.

5. This is true also of Western Science vs. Indigenous Knowledge (Nicholas and Markey 2014).
6. Indeed, La Salle and Hutchings mis-state our views on Indigenous archaeology. They quote Martindale and Lyons (2014:426) as arguing, "the emphasis is on how to bring "Indigenous archaeology into the archaeological orthodoxy". The full sentence reveals our true meaning,

In this context it is useful to consider Nicholas' (2010a) provocative thesis that we should work to end Indigenous archaeology, by which he means we should seek ways to bring the insights of Indigenous archaeology into the archaeological orthodoxy rather than leave it on the margins.

In fact we are arguing the reverse of what La Salle and Hutchings state: Indigenous archaeology should not be subsumed within archaeological orthodoxies, rather orthodox archaeology should be transformed by Indigenous scholarship.

7. This is a major part of Lyons' localized critical theory (2013, 2014), which Mark Leone has acknowledged as a logical extension of his work in Annapolis Royal (Leone, personal communication 1995, 2010).
8. This was at the core of a recent public symposium and workshop, "DNA and

Indigeneity: The Changing Role of Genetics in Indigenous Rights, Tribal Belonging, and Repatriation" (Nicholas et al. 2016), in which Tallbear was a participant; videos of the public symposium here: <http://www.sfu.ca/ipinch/resources/videos>.

9. See the session "Indigenous Archaeology in British Columbia" in the 2016 Society for Applied Anthropology conference in Vancouver organized by Martindale that includes 11 presentations based on Indigenous/archaeological partnerships.
10. Some of these are confidential, involving, for example, the search for burials associated with former Indian Residential Schools.
11. Indeed, there is much attention to this issue by Indigenous scholars outside of archaeology (e.g., Grande 2004; Mihesuah and Wilson 2004; Smith 2008, 2012).
12. Irons (2012) effectively re-frames archaeology as the performance of a range of narrative structures emergent from the cultural milieu of its practitioners. This critique recasts archaeology as a self-fulfilling biography in which archaeologists are easily caricatured. For example, Andrew Martindale is the buffoonish "Dr. X" of Appendix A, while Kisha Supernant is the similarly caricatured "Dr. Y"; Irons appears to have mis-identified her as not Indigenous.
13. La Salle and Hutchings found this paper especially opaque, a fair critique. It was written specifically to be considered in a legal context to make a case for the vulnerability of archaeology to ethnocentrism, but maintaining its capacity to describe Indigenous history. It was, in part, a response to *R. v Lax Kw'alaams* an Aboriginal rights and titles case which was taken to the

Supreme Court of Canada and which is built out of an expert witness report (Lovesik 2007) which contains pervasive and fundamental errors about Martindale's scholarship (Martindale 2013).

References Cited

- Angelbeck, B., and C. Grier
2014 From Paradigms to Practices: Pursuing Horizontal and Long-Term Relationships with Indigenous Peoples for Archaeological Heritage Management. *Canadian Journal of Archaeology* 38(2):519–540.
- Atalay, S.
2008 Pedagogy of Decolonization: Advancing Archaeological Practice Through Education. In *Collaborating at the Trowel's Edge: Teaching and Learning in Indigenous Archaeology*, edited by S. Silliman, pp. 123–144. University of Arizona Press, Tucson, Arizona.
- 2010a Raise Your Head and Be Proud Ojibwekwe. In *Being and Becoming Indigenous Archaeologists*, edited by G. Nicholas, pp. 45–54. Left Coast Press, Walnut, Creek, California.
- 2010b *Diba Jimooyung* Telling Our Story: Colonization and Decolonization of Archaeological Practice from an Anishinabe Perspective. In *Handbook of Postcolonial Archaeology*, edited by U. Rizvi and J. Lydon, pp. 61–72, World Archaeological Congress and Left Coast Press, Walnut Creek, California.
- 2012 *Community Based Archaeology: Research With, by and for Indigenous and Local Communities*. University of California Press, Berkeley, California.
- Atalay, S., L. R. Clauss, R. H. McGuire, and J. R. Welch.
2014 Transforming Archaeology. In *Transforming Archaeology*, edited by S. Atalay, L. R. Clauss, R. H. McGuire,

- and J. R. Welch. Left Coast Press, Walnut Creek, California.
- Atleo, E. R.
2004 *Tsawalk: A Nuu-chah-nulth World-view*. UBC Press, Vancouver, British Columbia.
- Battle-Baptiste, W.
2011 *Black Feminist Archaeology*. Left Coast Press, Walnut Creek, California.
- Bruchac, M.
2007 Historical Erasure and Cultural Recovery: Indigenous People in the Connecticut River Valley. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Department of Anthropology, University of Massachusetts, Amherst, Massachusetts.
2014 Decolonization in Archaeological Theory. In *Encyclopedia of Global Archaeology*, edited by Claire Smith, pp. 2069–2077. Springer, New York.
- Clarke, D. L.
1973 Archaeology: The Loss of Innocence. *Antiquity* 47:6–18.
- Colwell-Chanthaphonh, C., T. J. Ferguson, D. Lippert, R. H. McGuire, G. P. Nicholas, J. E. Watkins, and L. J. Zimmerman
2010 The Premise and Promise of Indigenous Archaeology. *American Antiquity* 75(2):228–238.
- Connaughton, S., M. Leon, and J. Herbert
2014 Collaboration, Partnerships, and Relationships within a Corporate World. *Canadian Journal of Archaeology* 38(2):541–562.
- Croes, D. R.
2010 Courage and Thoughtful Scholarship = Indigenous Archaeological Partnerships. *American Antiquity* 75(2):211–216.
- Echo-Hawk, R.
2010 *The Magic Children: Radial Identity at the End of the Age of Race*. Left Coast Press, Walnut Creek, California.
- Echo-Hawk, R., and L. Zimmerman
2006 Beyond Racism: Some Opinions about Racism and American Archaeology. *American Indian Quarterly* 30(3–4):461–485.
- Giddens, A.
1984 *The Constitution of Society: Outline of a Theory of Structuration*. University of California Press, Berkeley, California.
- Gould, R.
2014 Cultural Practice and Authenticity: The Search for Real Indians in New England in the “Historical” Period. In *The Death of Prehistory*, edited by P. R. Schmidt and S. A. Mrozowski, pp. 241–266. Oxford University Press, Oxford and New York.
- Grande, S.
2003 Whitestream Feminism and the Colonialist Project: A Review of Contemporary Feminist Pedagogy and Practice. *Educational Theory* 53(3):329.
2004 *Red Pedagogy: Native American Social and Political Thought*. Rowan and Littlefield, Lanham, Maryland.
- Graves-Brown, P., R. Harrison, and A. Piccini (editors)
2013 *The Oxford Handbook of the Archaeology of the Contemporary World*. Oxford University Press, Oxford, England.
- Grier, C., and L. Shaver
2008 Working Together: The Role of Archaeologists and First Nations in Sorting Out Some Very Old Problems in British Columbia. *The SAA Record* 8(1):33–35.
- Handsman, R. G.
1995 Confronting Colonialism: The Mahican and Schaghticoke Peoples and Us. In *Making Alternative Histories. The Practice of Archaeology and*

- History in Non-Western Settings*, edited by P. R. Schmidt and T. C. Patterson, pp. 87–117. School of American Research Press, Santa Fe, New Mexico.
- Hennessy, K., N. Lyons, M. Joe, S. Loring, and C. Arnold.
2013 The Inuvialuit Living History Project: Digital Return as the Forging of Relationships between Institutions, People, and Data. *Museum Anthropology Review* 7(1–2):44–73.
- Hutchings, R., and M. La Salle
2016 Why Archaeologists Misrepresent Their Practice—A North American Perspective. *Journal of Contemporary Archaeology* [S.l.], 2(2):S11–S17.
- Intellectual Property Issues in Cultural Heritage Project (IPinCH)
2015 Declaration on the Safeguarding of Indigenous Ancestral Burial Grounds as Sacred Sites and Cultural Landscapes. Electronic document, <http://www.sfu.ca/ipinch/resources/declarations>, accessed April 1, 2016.
- Irons, J.
2012 Ethnographic Perspectives on Laxyuup Gitxaala. Unpublished Master's thesis, Department of Anthropology, University of British Columbia, Vancouver.
- Kawelu, K.
2015 *Kuleana and Commitment: Working toward a Collaborative Hawaiian Archaeology*. University of Hawai'i Press, Honolulu.
- Kintigh, K. W., J. H. Altschul, M. C. Beaudry, R. D. Drennan, A. P. Kingiz, T. A. Kohler, F. W. Limp, H. D. G. Maschner, W. K. Michener, T. R. Pauketat, P. Peregrine, J. A. Sabloff, T. J. Wilkinson, H. T. Wright, and M. A. Zeder.
2014 Grand Challenges for Archaeology. *American Antiquity* 79(1):5–24.
- La Salle, M.
2010 Community Collaboration and Other Good Intentions. *Archaeologies: Journal of the World Archaeological Congress* 6(3):401–422.
2013 The Trouble with 'Co-'. Paper presented at the 46th Canadian Archaeological Association Annual Conference, Whistler, British Columbia.
- La Salle M., and R. Hutchings
2012 Commercial Archaeology in British Columbia. *The Midden* 44(2):6–8.
2016a What Makes Us Squirm—A Response to “Community-Oriented Archaeology” *Canadian Journal of Archaeology* 40(1):164–180.
- Leone, M.
1995 A Historical Archaeology of Capitalism. *American Anthropologist* 97(2):251–268.
2010 *Critical Historical Archaeology*. Left Coast Press, Walnut Creek California.
2013 Personal Communication. Reviewers' comments to Natasha Lyons on her *American Antiquity* manuscript, received 10 December 2013.
- Lovisek, J. A.
2007 *The Lax Kw'alaams Indian Band and Others v. The Attorney General of Canada and Her Majesty the Queen in Right of the Province of British Columbia*. Submitted to James M. Mackenzie, Department of Justice, British Columbia Regional Office, Vancouver, British Columbia.
- Lydon, J., and U. Rizvi
2010 *Handbook of Postcolonial Archaeology*. World Archaeological Congress and Left Coast Press, Walnut Creek, California.
- Lyons, N.
2013 *Where the Wind Blows Us: Practic-*

- ing *Critical Community Archaeology in the Canadian North*. The University of Arizona Press, Tucson, Arizona.
- 2014 Localized Critical Theory as an Expression of Community Archaeology Practice: With a Case Study from Inuvialuit Elders of the Canadian Western Arctic. *American Antiquity* 79(2):183–203.
- Lyons, N., I. Cameron, T. Hoffman, and D. Miller
- 2012a Many Shades of Grey: Dispelling some Myths about the Nature & Status of CRM in British Columbia, A Response to La Salle & Hutchings. *The Midden* 44(3/4).
- Lyons, N., P. Dawson, M. Walls, D. Ulualuak, L. Angalik, M. Kalluak, P. Kigusituak, L. Kiniksi, J. Karetak, and L. Suluk
- 2010 Person, Place, Memory, Thing: How Inuit Elders are Informing Archaeological Practice in the Canadian North. *Canadian Journal of Archaeology* 34(1):1–31.
- Lyons, N., K. Hennessy, M. Joe, C. Arnold, A. Elias, S. Loring, and J. Pokiak
- 2012b The Inuvialuit Living History Project. *The SAA Archaeological Record* 12(4):39–42.
- Lyons, N., and Y. Marshall
- 2014 Memory, Practice, Telling Community. *Canadian Journal of Archaeology* 38(2):496–518.
- Martindale, A.
- 2013 *A Summary and Analysis of Specific Errors in Lovesik's (2007) Expert Witness Report Prepared for The British Columbia Department of Justice and Submitted as Evidence in R. v Lax Kw'alaams*. Report prepared for the Lax Kw'alaams and Metlakatla Indian Bands.
- 2014 Archaeology Taken to Court: Unraveling the Epistemology of Cultural Tradition in the Context of Aboriginal Title Cases. In *Rethinking Colonial Pasts through Archaeology*, edited by N. Ferris, R. Harrison, and M. V. Wilcox, pp. 397–422. Oxford University Press, Oxford, England.
- Martindale, A., and N. Lyons
- 2014 Introduction: "Community-Oriented Archaeology". *Canadian Journal of Archaeology* 38(2):425–433.
- Martindale, A., and S. Marsden
- 2003 Defining the Middle Period (3500 BP to 1500 BP) in Tsimshian History through a Comparison of Archaeological and Oral Records." *BC Studies* 138:13–50.
- 2011 *Analysis of territorial claims made in "Lax Kw'alaams: Review of Historical and Ethnographic Sources" and "Metlakatla: Review of Historical and Ethnographic Sources" documents prepared by the Aboriginal Research Division of the British Columbia Ministry of Attorney General Legal Services Branch*. Report prepared for the Lax Kw'alaams and Metlakatla Indian Bands.
- Martindale, A., and G. Nicholas
- 2014 Archaeology as Federated Knowledge. *Canadian Journal of Archaeology* 38(2):434–465.
- McGhee, R.
- 2008 Aboriginalism and the Problems of Indigenous Archaeology. *American Antiquity* 73(4):579–597.
- McGuire, R. H.
- 1992 *A Marxist Archaeology*. Academic Press, New York, New York.
- 2008 Archaeology as Political Action. University of California Press, Berkeley, California.

- McHalsie, A., D. Schaepe, and K. Carlson
 2001 Making the World Right Through Transformations. In *A Stó:lō-Coast Salish Historical Atlas*, edited by Keith Carlson, David Schaepe, Albert McHalsie, David Smith, Leeanna Rhodes, and Colin Duffield, pp. 6–7. Stó:lō Heritage Trust/Douglas-McIntyre/University of Washington Press, Vancouver, British Columbia.
- McNiven, I.J.
 2016 Theoretical Challenges of Indigenous Archaeology: Setting an Agenda. *American Antiquity* 81(1):27–41.
- Menzies, C.
 2013 Standing on the Shore with Saaban: An Anthropological Rapprochement with an Indigenous Intellectual Tradition. *Collaborative Anthropologies* 6:171–199.
 2015a Revisiting “Dm Sibilhaa’nm Da Laxyuubm Gitxaala (Picking Abalone in Gitxaala Territory)”: Vindication, Appropriation, and Archaeology. *BC Studies* 187(Autumn):129–155.
 2015b Oil, Energy, and Anthropological Collaboration on the Northwest Coast of Canada. *Journal of Anthropological Research* 71:5–21.
- Mihesuah, D., and C. Wilson (editors)
 2004 *Indigenizing the Academy: Transforming Scholarship and Empowering Communities*. University of Nebraska Press, Lincoln, Nebraska.
- Miller, B.G.
 2011 *Oral History on Trial*. UBC Press, Vancouver, British Columbia.
- Million, Tara
 2003 The Ghost Dance of Archaeology. In *Indigenous Peoples and Archaeology*, edited by Trevor Peck, Evelyn Siegfried, and Gerald Oetelaar, pp. 52–68. University of Calgary Archaeological Association, Calgary, Alberta.
- Nicholas, G.P.
 2010a Seeking the End of Indigenous Archaeology. In *Bridging the Divide: Indigenous Communities and Archaeology into the 21st Century*, edited by H. Allen and C. Phillips, pp. 233–252. Left Coast Press, Walnut Creek, California.
 2014 Indigenous Archaeology (“Archaeology, Indigenous”). In *Oxford Bibliography of Anthropology*, edited by J.L. Jackson. Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Nicholas, G.P. (editor)
 2010b *Being and Becoming Indigenous Archaeologists*. Left Coast Press, Walnut Creek, California.
- Nicholas, G.P., and N.M. Markey
 2014 Traditional Knowledge, Archaeological Evidence, and Other Ways of Knowing. In *Material Evidence: Learning from Archaeological Practice*, edited by R. Chapman and A. Wylie, pp. 287–307. Routledge Press, London.
- Nicholas, G., A. Walker, and A. Goodman
 2016 DNA and Indigeneity. *Anthropology News*. American Anthropological Association. March.
- Piccini, A., and D. Schaepe
 2014 The Messy Business of Archaeology as Participatory Local Knowledge A Conversation Between the Stó:lō Nation and Knowle West. *Canadian Journal of Archaeology* 38(2):466–495.
- Prakash, G.
 1994 Subaltern Studies as Postcolonial Criticism. *The American Historical Review* 99(5):1475–1490.
- Reimer, R.
 2011 The Mountains and Rocks are

- Forever: Lithics and Landscapes of *skwxwú7mesh uxwumixw*. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Department of Anthropology, McMaster University, Hamilton, Ontario.
- Rigney, L. I.
2003 The First Perspective: Culturally Safe Research Practices on or with Indigenous Peoples. In *Indigenous People and Archaeology: Honouring the Past, Discussing the Present, Building the Future*, edited by T. Peck, E. Siegfried, and G. Oetelaar, pp. 226–244. University of Calgary Archaeological Association, Calgary, Alberta.
- Roth, K. L.
2015 Practices of Collaboration: Exploring Institutional Culture at the Laboratory of Archaeology. Unpublished Master's thesis, Department of Anthropology, University of British Columbia, Vancouver, British Columbia.
- Sahlins, M.
1996 The Sadness of Sweetness: The Native Anthropology of Western Cosmology. *Current Anthropology* 37(3):395–428.
- Sassaman, K.
2014 Editor's Corner. *American Antiquity* 79(1):3–4.
- Schaepe, D., A. McHalsie, P. Ormerod, and K. Carlson.
2001 Changing Households, Changing Houses. In *A Stó:lō-Coast Salish Historical Atlas*, edited by Keith Carlson, David Schaepe, Albert McHalsie, David Smith, Leeanna Rhodes, and Colin Duffield, pp. 40–47. Stó:lō Heritage Trust/Douglas-McIntyre/University of Washington Press, Vancouver, Washington.
- Shanks, M.
2012 *The Archaeological Imagination*. Left Coast Press, Walnut Creek, California.
- Shanks, M., and C. Tilley
1989 Archaeology into the 1990's. *Norwegian Archaeological Review* 22(1):1–12.
- Sharp, J.
2008 *Geographies of Postcolonialism*. SAGE, London, England.
- Silliman, S. W.
2010 The Value and Diversity of Indigenous Archaeology: A Response to McGhee. *American Antiquity* 75(2):217–220.
- Smith, L. T.
2005 On Tricky Ground: Researching the Native in the Age of Uncertainty. In *The Sage Handbook of Qualitative Research*, 3rd ed., edited by N. K. Denzin and Y. S. Lincoln, pp. 85–107. Sage Press, Thousand Oaks, California.
- 2008 Research through Imperial Eyes. In *Ethnic Studies Research - Approaches and Perspectives*, edited by T. Fong, pp. 125–141. AltaMira Press, Plymouth, United Kingdom.
- 2012 *Decolonizing Methodologies: Research and Indigenous Peoples*. Zed Books, London.
- Stoller, P.
2007 Ethnography/Memoir/Imagination/Story. *Anthropology and Humanism* 32(2):178–191.
- Supernant, K., and G. Warrick
2014 Challenges to Critical Community-based Archaeological Practice in Canada. *Canadian Journal of Archaeology* 38(2):563–591.
- Sutton, D., L. Furey, and Y. Marshall
2003 *The Archaeology of Pouerua*. Auckland University Press, Auckland, New Zealand.
- Tallbear, K.
2013 *Native American DNA: Tribal Belonging and the False Promise of Genetic*

- Science*. University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis, Minnesota.
- Trigger, B. G.
1980 Archaeology and the Image of the American Indian. *American Antiquity* 45:662–676.
1984 Alternative Archaeologies: Nationalist, Colonialist, Imperialist. *Man* 19:355–370.
- Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada
2015 *The Final Report of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada, Volume 6, Canada's Residential Schools: Reconciliation*. McGill-Queens University Press, Montreal, Quebec and Kingston, Ontario.
- Two Bears, D.
2006 Navajo Archaeologist Is Not an Oxymoron: A Tribal Archaeologist's Experience. *American Indian Quarterly* 30(3 and 4):381–387.
- Watkins, J.
2003 Beyond the Margin: American Indians, First Nations, and Archaeology in North America. *American Antiquity* 68(22):273–286.
2010a Wake Up! Repatriation Is Not the Only Indigenous Issue in Archaeology! In *Bridging the Divide: Indigenous Communities and Archaeology into the 21st Century*, edited by C. Phillips and H. Allen, pp. 49–60. Left Coast Press, Walnut, Creek, California.
2010b "Becoming One of 'Them.'" In *Being and Becoming Indigenous Archaeologists*, edited by G. Nicholas, pp. 321–326. Left Coast Press, Walnut Creek, California.
- Weaver, H. N.
2001 Indigenous Identity: What Is It, and Who Really Has It? *American Indian Quarterly* 25(2):240–255.
- Welch, J., and N. Ferris
2014 "We Have Met The Enemy And He Is Us": Transforming Archaeology Through Sustainable Design. In *Transforming Archaeology*, edited by S. Atalay, L. R. Clauss, R. H. McGuire, and J. R. Welch, pp. 91–113. Left Coast Press, Walnut Creek, California.
- West, R. G.
1995 Saving and Naming the Garbage: Charles E. Bordon and the Making of B.C. Prehistory. Unpublished Master's thesis, Department of History, University of British Columbia, Vancouver, British Columbia.
- Wilcox, M.
2009 *The Pueblo Revolt and the Mythology of Conquest: An Indigenous Archaeology of Contact*. University of California Press, Berkeley, California.
2010 Saving Indigenous Peoples from Ourselves: Separate but Equal Archaeology is Not Scientific Archaeology. *American Antiquity* 75(2):221–227.
- Wilson, C.
2007 Indigenous Research and Archaeology: Transformative Practices in/with/for the Ngarrindjeri Community. *Archaeologies* 3(3):320–334.
- Wylie, A.
2012 Feminist Philosophy of Science: Standpoint Matters. *Proceedings and Addresses of the American Philosophical Association* 86(2):47–76.
- Yellowhorn, E.
2002 Awakening Internalist Archaeology in the Aboriginal World. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Department of Anthropology, McGill University, Montreal, Quebec.

Manuscript received May 1, 2016.

Final revisions May 20, 2016.